DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 810 **PS 010 622**

AUTHOR	Kirst, Michael W.; And Others
TITLE	State Services for Children: An Exploration of Who Benefits, Who Governs.
INSTITUTION	Stanford Univ., Calif. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Bank Street Coll. of Education, New York, N.Y.; Merrill-Palmer Inst., Detroit, Mich.; Pacific Oaks Coll., Pasadena, Calif.
PUB DATE	Apr 79
NOTE	35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1979)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Care; *Information Needs; Political Influences; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Research; *Social Services; State Federal Aid; *State Programs; State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	California; Early Periodic Screening Diagnosis and Treatment; Michigan; New York; *Social Security Act Title XX; Special Supplemen Food Program Women Infants Child

ABSTRACT

This hypothesis-generating study of New York, Michigan and California social services for children attempts to assess the adequacy of Title XX social service programs, the WIC (women, infants and children) feeding program, and the EPSDT (early periodic screening, diagnosis and treatment) program. Data were obtained through literature searches, analysis of government documents, and interviews with government service providers, legislative aides, and consumers of services. Initial conclusions from work in progress are: (1) In the field of children's social services, data compilation is approximately 20 years behind the state of the art for education, and basic data on services provided is not collected for submission to state or federal authorities in any standard format on a recurring basis; (2) From the limited data available, the access of children to quantity and quality in social service programs varies enormously within states, with much larger variations than those discovered in the public financing of education even before the recent school finance reform movement (1968-1978); (3) Federal allocations to states for social service programs comprise a substantial proportion of state Title XX budgets; for several reasons, there is not the same degree of accountability for these funds as for federal education grants; and (4) In all three states Title XX state allocations to localities are purported to be based on need, but closer examination of the formulae and interviews with policy makers revealed that Title XX allocations are determined primarily by political criteria. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

ED171410

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

STATE SERVICES FOR CHILDREN: AN EXPLORATION OF WHO BENEFITS, WHO GOVERNS

Michael W. Kirst, Walter Garms
and Theo Oppermann*

March 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michael W. Kirst

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

PS 010622

*Michael Kirst is Associate Professor of Education, Stanford University; Walter Garms is Professor of Education, University of Rochester; Theo Oppermann is a Research Assistant at Stanford University.

This study was supported by the National Consortium for Children and Youth (Pacific Oaks College, Merrill-Palmer Institute, and Bank Street College).

STATE SERVICES FOR CHILDREN: AN EXPLORATION

OF WHO BENEFITS, WHO GOVERNS

Abstract

In recent years, equity, choice, and efficiency issues in the provision of education have received much attention and analysis. More than 60 percent of the nation's pupils will be affected by school finance reform. Out-of-school influences can be crucial in determining in-school performance. Yet, in the area of other state services for children (health, protective services, day care, etc.), there has been scant concern for equity, efficiency, or choice.

This paper reports on work in progress that reaches the following initial conclusions:

1) In the field of children's social services, data compilation is approximately 20 years behind the state of the art for education. Basic data on services provided is not collected for submission to state or federal authorities in any standard format on a recurring basis.

2) From the limited data available, the access of children to quantity and quality in social service programs varies enormously within states. The variations are much larger than those discovered in the public financing of education even before the recent school finance reform movement (1968-1978).

3) Federal allocations to states for social service programs comprise a substantial proportion of state Title XX budgets. For several reasons, there is not the degree of accountability for these funds as for federal education grants.

4) In all three states Title XX state allocations to localities are purported to be based on need. Closer examination of the formulae, and interviews with policy makers, revealed that Title XX allocations are determined primarily by political criteria.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful for the assistance of the National Consortium for Children and Youth (Pacific Oaks College, Merrill-Palmer Institute, and Bank Street College).

The most widespread and expensive state service for children is education. In recent years, equity and efficiency issues in the provision of education and educational services have received much attention and analysis.[1] More than twenty states have passed legislation to equalize educational expenditures among local school districts. In addition to education, however, states provide a wide range of social service programs for children. In California, during FY 1977-78, over $5.5 billion of state and federal funds were spent on more than 160 programs (including programs other than education) servicing children and youth in the state.[2] While states provide a variety of social service programs for children, of which the federal share of program expenditures is 50 percent or higher, children's social service programs have not been subject to the public scrutiny and accountability standards applied in the education sector. There is a paradox between the intensive information and analysis of education and a lack of attention to other children's services. This paper will explore the nature and implications of this information paradox. The information presented here suggests enormous variations in local delivery of children's services.

This exploratory study of state social services for children was undertaken in three states: New York, Michigan, and California. This report focuses on the following statutes: 1) Title XX social service programs, 2) the WIC (women, infant and children) feeding program, and 3) EPSDT (Early Periodic, Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment Program). Eight Title XX programs were studied intensively: special diagnostic services for children (a program providing care, in a residential setting, to children who are emotionally disturbed); services to alleviate or prevent family problems; services for children with special problems (a program providing client needs assessment and arrangements for counseling and service delivery); special care for children in their own homes (provides temporary household management help to reduce reliance on out-of-home foster care); health related services (a program designed to assist individuals and families in securing, and appropriately utilizing, needed health care services); child care; out-of-home services (a program providing emergency care for children); child protective services (a program serving children who are abused, neglected, or exploited); and home management services.

One of the first difficulties encountered in our study was that of defining the scope of children's services. Children benefit directly and indirectly from a variety of social service programs which are administered by a wide variety of agencies and departments with little concern for overall service coordination. In this study we selected programs which were comparable across states, with a major focus on Title XX programs as this is one of the few programs with a federal mandate for state plans and data compilation.

Title XX of the Social Security Act, which became effective on October 1, 1975, provides money for a broad range of social services programs. Those programs may include such services as child day care, homemaker services, services to the handicapped, children's protective services, legal services, senior citizens programs, and information and referral services. Each state is allotted a share of $2.5 billion in federal funds, which can be used to pay 75 percent of the costs of social services included in that state's Comprehensive Annual Services Plan. To get the federal money, the state must raise the other 25 percent, through state/local appropriations or through donations from public or private agencies.

The federal government does not tell a state how to spend its Title XX money. It does prohibit use of Title XX funds for major medical or subsistence (i.e., room and board) costs, sets maximum limits on eligibility, and requires certain administrative and record-keeping procedures. But within these broad guidelines, the state is free to define its own services, to determine who will receive them, and to contract with service providers -- including local community groups.

Title XX is not a totally new program. It replaces the social services programs previously authorized under Titles IV-A and VI of the Social Security Act. The $2.5 billion was available to states under these sections of these laws and, in fact, a number of states, including California, were already spending their share of the national ceiling before Title XX became effective.

What <u>is</u> new about Title XX is the requirement that a state undertake an open public planning process. This gives the public a chance to find out what the state is doing with social service dollars and to organize

so that children and families get their fair share. If a state is already spending all of its federal Title XX allocation, public participation could cause shifts among priorities within the plan.

Before it can receive Title XX funds, a state must prepare a Comprehensive Annual Services Program Plan (CASP). This plan must contain specific information about the types of services the state will fund, eligibility, fee schedules, geographic areas where services will be offered, sources of the state's matching funds, and the administration of the program. Federal law requires that this planning process be an open one, and that the public have the opportunity to participate in it.

An extensive literature search of major journals in the fields of human resources and social services revealed that a study of social services for children would be pioneering a new field.[3] No comprehensive or systematic study of social services for children was uncovered.

One methodological obstacle to our study was an unclear operational definition of "quality" or "adequacy" in children's social services. The problem is operational in the sense that different professional and lay audiences have dissimilar views as to what constitutes "quality" or "adequate" care. It is methodological because the necessary work to establish a limited number of indicators of "adequacy" or "quality" is incomplete. The Foundation for Child Development has recently supported research on social indicators of the well-being of children, including their service needs.[4] Quality is often defined merely in terms of the quantity of professional services provided to children.

Each of the case writers in the three states was instructed to examine three areas: 1) Title XX; 2) WIC; 3) EPSTD. But case writers were free to

explore other programs if they thought there would be unusual insights for future research. Since an objective of the study was hypothesis-generating rather than confirming, we did not want to completely restrict the researchers' scope. The study was heuristic and designed to raise policy issues rather than explain the outcomes. Researchers used literature searches, analysis of government documents, and interviews with government providers, legislative aides, and consumers of services. All researchers focused on the following issues:[5]

1) What information exists concerning children's services?

2) What are the differences among county/local service levels?

3) How are these service differences correlated with some measures of need? Measures of need included disadvantaged children under Title I ESEA (family income below Orshansky's poverty definition or AFDC), county per capita income, other measures of income, and the total Title XX population served.

4) Do federal and state allocation policies cause differences in local service levels? If so, which services and what are the specific federal or state allocation formulas?

We chose three industrial states that display a range of political, economic, and administrative approaches. For example, Michigan provides many social services directly without using county government. New York City is a unique situation because it absorbs 80 percent of the state's Title XX child care. California relies on county governments for service delivery. We make no claim that these three states are representative of the United States. Moreover, we did not use a controlled-comparison research strategy. Consequently, the findings must be stated in terms of three similar, but not idential case studies. This is the type of case study noted by George as a "plausibility probe."[6] Here the investigator employs a case study at a preliminary stage of inquiry before he is ready to undertake

a more vigorous testing of general hypotheses. The purpose is to judge whether the findings warrant making a major investment in more thorough, hopefully more decisive hypothesis-testing studies.

Data was collected for federal/state distribution formulas to all local units. Two counties within each state were explored on a more detailed basis. In order to select counties, we computed the: 1) number of families with children under 18; 2) families with children under six years; 3) families headed by single females; 4) families headed by two parents; 5) employment status of parents; 6) family income broken down by family type and ages of children. Data were collected on the supply of services from Title XX plans, five deliveries of day care, WIC, and EPST. We also cross-checked the above indicators with 35 other socio-economic indicators per county. The objective was to select counties that were representative of approximately the 30 to 75 percentiles of service levels and were roughly matched on the basis of socio-economic characteristics (see Tables I and II in the next section). Santa Clara and Fresno Counties met these criteria for intensive field investigation in California. We deliberately avoided extreme cases of service levels such as the highest (San Francisco) and lowest. Our earlier work in school finance suggested such extreme cases were misleading for policy purposes.

Research Conclusions

The six major conclusions below apply to the three states (concerning state government policies) and the two counties within each state for local policies.

1. In the field of children's social services, state data compilation is approximately 20 years behind the state of the art for education. Basic

data on services provided is not collected in any of the three states for submission to state or federal authorities in any standard format on a recurring basis. For example, we found counties have only vague estimates as to the number of children benefitting from or participating in social service programs. Often there does not exist basic descriptive data concerning specific characteristics of the children receiving services under various programs. There often does not even exist an accounting of the various services offered under particular programs. State officials knew very little about local Title XX allocations and program impact. There is no federal or state statistical agency analogous to HEW's National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). We reviewed data collected by NCES, the National Education Association, and the three state governments in 1958. State and local education data was extensive in standard categories of per pupil expenditures by school district with numerous sub-categories. By contrast we had to compile data on children's services by going to local administrators for best estimates, or rely on projections from program plans. We hoped to identify what individual counties were spending of their own resources on Title XX programs. In this manner we could separate out local tax effort for children's services from the effects of federal and state distribution formulas for localities. This data was unavailable, however, except through interviews. There is no requirement for counties to report this information to the state. Furthermore, low social service level counties tend to be defensive during interviews concerning their social service programs. They are reluctant to share internal county data with outsiders. Consequently, all data in our tables indicate the merged effect of local tax effort (primarily property tax rates) and state distribution of state and federal funds. Equal tax yield for

equal local tax burden has been a crucial concept in school finance reform. State education formulas are designed to even out the variations in the local property tax. This is not possible under the current distribution system for other children's services.

2. From the limited data available, the access of children to quantity and quality in social service programs varies enormously within states. The variations are much larger than those discovered in the public financing of education even before the recent school finance reform movement (1968-1978). The differences are so large than even allowing for poor estimates by local officials does not mitigate the overall impression. Fresno County, California, for example, proposed to spend four cents per capita for child protective services in FY 1978 while Santa Clara County proposed to spend $49.06.[7] Monroe County, New York spends $9.32 per capita for five social services (adoption, day care, foster care, information and referral, child protective services), while Alleghany County, New York

(Table I here)

spends $232 per capita for this same package.[8] These differences are so large that they cannot be explained by less "need" on the part of children in various localities.

Part of the explanation for these vast differences is that federal or state guaranteed minimum floors or foundations do not exist for social service provision as they do in education.[9] Minimum floors or foundations in education present a state financial guarantee that a basic level of education will be provided on an equal basis to all students in the state. Two equity concerns motivate the current impulses for reform in the financing of public education. One is the concern that variation in the revenues available

Table 1.

STATISTICAL COMPARISONS OF THE LEVEL OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES IN FRESNO AND SANTA CLARA COUNTIES, 1976.

	(1) FRESNO	(2) FRESNO	(3) FRESNO	(4) SANTA CLARA	(5) SANTA CLARA	(6) SANTA CLARA
Title XX Mandated Programs	Proposed Expenditures Per Title 1 ESEA Eligible Children	Proposed Expenditures Per Total Population	Proposed Expenditures Per Person Served	Proposed Expenditures Per Title 1 ESEA Eligible Children	Proposed Expenditures Per Total Population	Proposed Expenditures Per Person Served
1. Information and Referral	.83	.05	55.35	25.56	.45	2.55
2. Protective Services for Children	.60	.04	39.91	49.06	.85	259.39
3. Out of Home Services for Children	.39	.02	55.35	120.25	2.10	201.43
4. Child Day Care Services	.08	.005	55.35	20.93	.37	571.28
5. Health Related Services	.73	.13	76.95	55.11	.96	241.11
Title XX Optional Programs						
1. Special Care for Children in their Homes	.50	.03	23.36	10.41	.18	516.65
2. Home Management and Other Functional Educational Services	9.65	.57	93.33	40.95	.71	215.41
3. Services for Children with Special Problems	-	-	-	12.65	.22	201.44
4. Services to Alleviate or Prevent Family Problems	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Diagnostic Treatment Services for Children	-	-	-	-	-	-

Figures derived from California Title XX plan and analysis of county fiscal records. (See explanation on following page.)

Column 1 is included because Title I ESEA eligible children is a good approximation of disadvantaged children who need governmental services. Title I includes children from below the federal poverty floor and families in AFDC. Column 3 is the total dollars spent on each service divided by the total number of clients served. Fresno serves very few children and consequently its fixed cost for operating information and referral service is spread over very few beneficiaries. This demonstrates the lack of outreach for clients compared to Santa Clara.

to public schools should not be related to the fiscal capacity (e.g., property tax wealth) of local school districts. The other is that education and educational services should be ample, thorough, and efficient. Although it is not certain whether these education equity concepts are ideal for assessing children's services, they have yet to be considered.

Below is an analysis of demographic and program variation among four California counties:

Table II

	Per capita income	Proportion of low income families	Proportion of high income families	Total Title XX* expenditures per client served
Santa Clara County	7011	.056	.349	$334.92
Orange County	6982	.052	.337	25.39
Fresno County	5838	.143	.173	12.78
Kern County	5733	.126	.175	107.07

*This is the total dollars spent on Title XX for all services (see Table I) divided by all clients served in all services.

Santa Clara and Orange Counties are high per capita income counties with similar demographic characteristics. They have very different expenditures for children's service programs. Fresno County and Kern County are a pair of low per capita income counties that are also similar in income and demographic characteristics. They also display vast differences in social service expenditures. While Title XX data are local estimates rather than audited figures, the order of magnitude in these county expenditure differences are far greater than the disparities found in educational finance. In local

education expenditures, per pupil variations of 200 percent would be considered extreme and rare.

The six counties that we investigated display a wide range of political orientations toward the desirability of aggressive outreach efforts in informing the public of children's social service program availability, or in identifying and informing potentially eligible clients of the programs. Oakland County, Michigan has the highest per capita income in Michigan; it is also one of the highest recipients among Michigan counties in funding for children's services.[10] Mecosta County, Michigan, with the lowest per capita income in the state, has only recently applied for participation in the WIC program, a nutrition program specifically designed to serve low income mothers and their children. The WIC allocation formula is supposed to satisfy all nutritional needs of program eligible mothers in the neediest counties before any increase in the allocations for less needy counties are made. However, participation in the WIC program is a function of county administrative/fiscal resources and political motivation. Counties able to afford personnel with grantsmanship skills have a competitive advantage in their applications. Although the existence of particular local social service programs are federal or state mandated, program comprehensiveness and service levels are not. The lack of federal or state policies for children is one large factor contributing to the variations among counties in their provision of social services.

Some high social service level counties have local coalitions that lobby at the state and local levels to protect and promote children's social services. The Council for Community Action Planning in Santa Clara County, California is one such coalition. Their modus operandi is to receive aid

requests from consumer groups, research the potential solutions and avenues for change, draft proposed changes to accommodate needs, and forward proposed changes to the County Board of Supervisors or agencies. Occasionally, they uncover gaps in services and lobby the county supervisors for new government programs. The Council does not represent all their constituent groups; instead they look for consensus among key organizations and employ topical task forces.

The Council's prime weapon is a threat of voter opposition to elected county officials. They provide information, fact finding, and research. They have established a considerable reputation for continuity, consistency, and longevity. They are responsible for the formation of the Santa Clara County Child and Adolescent Planning Commission that develops a plan for children's services.

3. Federal allocations to states for social service programs comprise a substantial proportion of state Title XX budgets. For several reasons, there is not the degree of accountability for these funds as for federal education grants. The federal government exerts far more control over its eight percent share of total educational expenditures than its 50 to 100 percent funding of children's social service programs. Accountability requires some basic information collected on a systematic and regular basis. This does not exist for Children's Services. Federal funds for Title XX social service programs are currently allocated to states on a straight per capita basis. No fiscal adjustments are made for the size of the states' poverty population, nor are dollars redistributed when returned to the federal government by states unwilling to spend their maximum allowances for Title XX services. One of the few federal requirements attached to

Title XX dollars is that 50 percent must be allocated for services or programs specifically addressed to the social service needs of low income people. This requirement is so general that no state or county has been found to be out of compliance. In education programs such as Title I ESEA, the federal government audits local expenditures to insure low income children receive benefits. No similar federal effort is devoted to state and local Title XX children's services. Since 1969 the federal/state education accountability movement has generated over 4,000 books or articles and legislation in 35 states.[11] Such concepts as minimum pupil competency, cost effectiveness and mandated teacher evaluation are featured in addition to detailed performance reporting.

4. In all three states Title XX state allocations to localities are purported to be based on need. Closer examination of the formulae, and interviews with policy makers, revealed that Title XX allocations are determined primarily by other criteria. Interviews in the six counties in three states uniformly revealed that the Title XX planning process and community involvement required by the federal government appear to be meaningless rituals. Title XX state plans are written in technical compliance terms with little or no attention to program operations, need, performance, or equity.[12] Officials admitted to "putting numbers in the boxes" based on guesses or wishful thinking, rather than facts.

In New York state the formula perpetuates differences in local social service expenditures because it is based on prior year expenditures. In FY 1972-73, allocations from New York state to the counties were based on a two-part formula. Half of the allocation was determined on a per capita basis; the other half on the basis of prior year social service expenditures.

There was no attention to such criteria as need, personal income, or local effectiveness in service delivery.

The California Title XX formula is also based on prior year expenditures and the favored localities have blocked changes in the state legislature. The allocation formulae for all three states perpetuate past service discrepancies and prevent appropriate adjustment to county changes in social service orientation or need. For instance, the political climate has changed recently in San Diego County, California in favor of more children's services. But the county is locked into a low level of effort based on prior political conditions.

The federal ceilings placed on Title XX expenditures in the early 1970s have introduced new rigidities into the allocation formula. For equity and equality reasons, attempts have been made in California to change the Title XX allocation to a "need" based formula. These efforts have proven to be politically unfeasible in these years of inflation and contracting social services. Changes in county preferences for more or less social service provision are difficult to monitor because of federal ceilings. Ceilings limit budget increases and restructuring of the allocation formula.

In sum, criteria of need or equity are not the primary basis for determining resource allocations and priorities at the federal or state level. This is in stark contrast to the success of school finance reforms that often include adjustments for local property tax wealth, incidence of disadvantaged, handicapped, bilingual, or municipal overburden. A 1978 Title XX amendment was introduced by Thomas Luken (D-Ohio), stating the state should distribute Title XX "equitably" among local subdivisions. No further detail was provided on equitable criteria and the amendment failed.

5. Responsibility for state social services for children is widely spread through state bureaucracies with little coordination among agencies. Provision of social services for children is decentralized to the local level with scant state supervision of services. This diffusion of authority and responsibility has led to weak state/local accountability. Coordination among agencies sharing responsibilities in the administration of particular programs (e.g., health and welfare share responsibility for the WIC and EPSDT programs) exist more "on paper" than in operation. For example, the programs (over 160) serving children and youth in California are administered through seven state cabinet departments and an additional 30 state agencies, departments, offices or commissions. The 1978 California Joint Legislative Audit Committee report is a first attempt to summarize all the disconnected children's programs in one state document. This report stresses the absence of coordination. We found no evidence of state comprehensive program planning in any of the three states.[13] The administrative delivery system is so complex that equity and accountability concerns are obscured.

6. A major conceptual problem in studying state services for children is the difficulty in separating services for children from services to families in general. An example is the controversy surrounding day care. Is day care characterized best as an educational service for children or as a child maintenance service for working parents? For example, New York City defines day care in terms of services to children, with a strong educational component, yet the rest of New York State defines day care as a service to parents.

Analyzing Specific Programs

In addition to a macro cross program study of social services, another approach is to look at one children's program in depth. HEW's Early Periodic Screening Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) program in California was selected. The EPSDT program provides health examinations and immunizations for Medic-aid eligible children. Ideally, children would have vision, hearing, dental, urine, blood, and TB checked periodically, as well as a complete health history and immunization. In California, the EPSDT program is part of a state initiated Child Health Disability Prevention Program (CHDP) that also includes low income but non-Medi-Cal eligible children. Across states the EPSDT program has been implemented slowly since its inception in 1967. In California the implementation has been further complicated since the program has been piggy-backed with the related state CHDP program.

CHDP/EPSDT is a federally funded, state matched, locally administered health program. Addressing the health needs of a cohort of children, rather than being categorically directed at a particular health problem, the operation of the program is dependent upon the coordination and cooperation of a large number of actors. These actors include health departments, schools, welfare offices, and medical care providers.

Vast differences exist among counties in the operation of the program. One measure of program output is the county screening rate, i.e., the proportion of program eligible children screened on schedule each year. These data are available from the state CHDP program. If one rank orders counties by this proportion and maps the ten counties with the highest screening rates and the ten counties with the lowest screening rates, interesting patterns

emerge. Counties with high screening rates are in low density population counties. Six of the ten counties are contract counties. (Contract counties are sparsely populated counties which, due to inadequate local health resources, have contracted with the State Department of Public Health for provision of CHDP health services.) Of the remaining four counties only two contain a large city.

All ten counties with the lowest screening rates are metropolitan (SMSA) counties with large cities. The ten counties are concentrated at two foci: one in the greater Bay Area and one along the heavily populated coast of Southern California. This is particularly noteworthy because one out of three CHDP eligible children live in Los Angeles County and SMSA counties are where there are proportionally more children. Obvious policy issues are suggested by this analysis: Why do these geographic patterns exist? Why is the state allocation formula biased toward rural contract counties? Why is there so much variation among counties in their screening rates? Little attention is given these questions in the California state government. Such inattention is indicative of the lack of inquiry in the entire field of children's services.

A Concluding Note

Three widely held values regarding government services in America are those of equity, efficiency, and choice.[14] The concern for equity manifests itself in a desire for access by all who need a governmental service, a desire that the service should be provided on an equal basis to equals and on an equitable basis to unequals, and a desire that the taxes that support the services be levied in an equitable manner.

The concern for efficiency is a simple desire that only those services be rendered by government that will not be adequately or fairly provided privately, and that governmental service be provided at the lowest expense to taxpayers consistent with desired service levels.

The concern for choice is reflected in a desire to keep governmental decisions as close as possible to those served, so clients and taxpayers may more easily influence the level of services and the ways in which they are rendered.

These three concerns are often in conflict and for any government service there is usually a balance struck among them. Given the data limitations, we are reluctant to say that the balance has been wrongly struck in the area of state services to children, but we do believe it is striking that the concerns so evident in education are absent.

In education, the major concern in recent years has been equity. The school finance lawsuits have emphasized equality of provision or equity for taxpayers, as have the school finance reforms. Moreover, both federal and state laws have stressed access for groups formerly effectively excluded (the handicapped and the non-English speaking), and equity in provision for these and other groups, such as the disadvantaged.

Educational efficiency has been a prime concern of state legislatures in their accountability statutes. Financial information has been supplemented by statewide pupil assessment and cost/effectiveness techniques.

Choice has been fostered in the past through delegation of the state responsibility for education to local school boards. As the concern for equity has brought more federal and state money into education, however, the powers of local boards have been eroded, and much decision-making power has

passed to higher levels. But numerous parent advisory councils have been mandated by federal/state statutes in order to give consumers more control over categorical programs.

On the other hand, in the area of other state services for children, there seems to have been little concern for equity, efficiency, or choice. Our admittedly exploratory study shows vast differences in expenditures, far beyond any conceivable differences in need. There are similar differences in clients served as a proportion of the population. It is abundantly clear that children with identical needs will be treated very differently in different communities. In many of those communities these children in need will be completely excluded from services. Neither states nor federal government require the kind of data collection that would make these inequitable distributions obvious. Inclusion of funding sources not covered in this report could lead to even more dramatic findings.

There has been little concern for efficiency. Services are widely spread through the bureaucracy, and local agencies often offer overlapping services. The lack of data at the state and federal levels is symptomatic of lack of knowledge and often disorganization at the local level. Even the most primitive concepts of accountability are absent.

There is scant attention to choice by the consumer. Federal money is passed through the state to local agencies with little in the way of supervision or mandates. These local agencies make widely varying decisions about which services to provide, how they are provided, and the level at which they are funded. Presumably these decisions reflect desires of local government officials, but we do not know if they reflect consumer priorities or needs.

Billions of dollars are spent equalizing education expenditures among school districts while children's health, infant nutrition, and Title XX services are left to vary according to the state and local fiscal capacity and politics. Thirty-five states have passed extensive educational accountability laws since 1968, while the remainder of children's services lack even the education accountability safeguards required prior to 1968. Children's needs are multiple and interactive. Out-of-school influences can be crucial in determining in-school performance.[15] While we are unwilling to characterize either system (education or other state services for children) as being good or bad compared with the other, we think the striking differences in the way they are organized, administered, and funded deserve further study. Is the difference between the two types of services so distinct that we should ignore these issues in children's services? State courts have ruled that education is a "fundamental" interest. Does this legal ruling justify such differential governmental concerns between education and other children's services? Why the strong emphasis on local government flexibility in the area of non-education services for children at the apparent expense of equity of access and provision? Are there basic differences between these two kinds of services that justify the lack of data concerning children's services? Why has so much policy analysis focused on education equity and so little on other services vital to child development?

If one agrees that there is no justification for such differential treatment between education and non-education services, some next steps are:

1) the establishment of an information system including services delivered, allocation formulas, and assessment of unmet needs, etc.

2) the construction of equity indexes in terms of the tables presented above;

3) research on how to measure quality of children's services;

4) policy research that focuses on causes and alternative policies for improving equity, efficiency, and consumer choice.

There are many possible reasons the measurement and federal/state monitoring of children's services are so inadequate compared to education. Some reasons are: a) legislation, such as Title XX and EPSDT, was passed in the seventies and it takes time to phase in; b) the lack of custom and experience of the agencies administering these programs compared to education; c) the ill-defined nature of quantity and quality of children's services compared to education; d) the expectation that service levels and definitions ought to vary considerably from one population to another according to perceived local need (in contrast to the uniformity assumed for a state system of education). While this paper did not attempt to explore these issues, we hope that follow-up research could provide a systematic explanation as a part of constructing hypotheses.

The Ten Highest Ranked Counties (by overall screening proportion). The range is from 0.35 to 0.93% of the CHDP target population screened (1976-77)
1.
Del Norte
Siskiyou
Modoc
Humboldt
Trinity
Shasta
Lassen
Tehama
Mendocino
Glenn
Butte
Plumas
Sierra
Colusa
Sutter
Yuba
Nevada
Lake
Placer
Sonoma
Napa
Yolo
Sacramento
El Dorado
Amador
Alpine
Solano
Calaveras
Marin
Contra Costa
San Joaquin
San Francisco
Tuolumne
Alameda
Mono
San Mateo
Santa Clara
Stanislaus
Mariposa
Merced
Santa Cruz
Madera
San Benito
Fresno
Monterey
Inyo
Tulare
Kings
San Luis Obispo
Kern
Santa Barbara
San Bernardino
Ventura
Los Angeles
Orange
Riverside
San Diego
Imperial

The Ten Lowest Ranked Counties, by Overall Screening Proportion. The range is from 6.0 to 12.0% of the CHDP target population screened. (1976-77)

General Sources on Children's Services

Brim, Orville G. "Macro-Structural Influences on Child Development and the Need for Childhood Social Indiactors," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 45 (4), July 1975.

California Department of Health, Social Services Division. Child Care: A Review of Social Services Funded Under Title XX of the Social Security Act (Sacramento) 1976.

California Legislature Senate and Assembly Joint Committee Hearing on Education. "Cost Effectiveness of Publicly Subsidized Child Care" (Sacramento), 1976.

Child Welfare in 25 States: An Overview (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1976.

Children's Defense Fund. "Children in Adult Jails" (Washington, D.C.: Washington Research Project), 1976.

_____. Children Out of School in America (Washington, D.C.: Washington Research Project), 1974.

_____. Children Without Homes: An Examination of Public Responsibility to Children in Out of Home Care (Washington, D.C.: Washington Research Project), 1977.

_____. EPSDT: Does It Spell Health Care for Poor Children? (Washington, D.C.: Washington Research Project), 1976.

_____. Title XX: Social Services in Your State: A Child Advocate's Handbook for Action (Washington, D.C.: Washington Research Project), 1976.

Class, Norris E. Growing Up in the 1970's: A Policy Statement for a System of State and County Departments of Children and Parent Services (Sacramento: Assembly Office of Research), 1975.

Education Commission of the States. "Early Childhood Development: Alternatives for Program Implementation in the States" (Denver: Early Childhood Project, Education Commission of the States), 1975.

_____. "Role of the Family in Child Development: Implications for State Policies and Programs" (Denver: Early Childhood Project), 1975.

_____. "Establishing a State Office of Early Childhood Development: Suggested Legislative Alternatives" (Denver: Early Childhood Project), 1975.

_____. "State Services in Child Development" (Denver: Early Childhood Project), 1975.

_____. "State Offices of Child Development" (Denver: Early Childhood Project), 1975.

Federal Programs for Young Children: Review and Recommendations (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), 1973. 4 Vols.

Grotberg, Edith H. (ed.). 200 Years of Children (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare), 1976.

Human Services Design Laboratory. Ohio Children's Budget Project (Ohio: School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University), 1975.

Kenneston, Kenneth. All Our Children (New York: Harcourt), 1977.

Lash, Trude W. and Heidi Sigel. State of the Child: New York City (New York City: Foundation for Child Development), 1976.

Levitan, Sara and Robert Taggart. The Promise of Greatness (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), 1976.

Legislative Analyst. "List and Explanations of Recommendations of Legislative Analyst as Contained in 'Analysis of the Budget Bill of the State of California for 1977-1978'" (Sacrament: State of California), 1977.

Nestande, Bruce. Child Abuse Detection and Treatment (Sacramento: Assembly Committee on Human Resources), 1977.

_____. Licensing of Community Care Facilities (Sacramento: Assembly Committee on Human Resources), 1977.

"Public Welfare in California," Statistical Series PA 3-211 (Sacramento: Department of Benefit Payments, Health and Welfare Agency), April 1977.

Report of the Legislative Analyst. Analysis of the Budget Bill (Sacramento: California Legislature), 1977.

"Response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 156" (Sacramento: Health and Welfare Agency) June 1977.

State of California. Annual Statewide Social Services Plan (Sacramento: Department of Health, Education and Welfare), 1977.

Sheehan, David. The Children's Puzzle: A Study of Services to Children in Massachusetts (Boston: Institute for Governmental Services), 1977.

Steiner, Gilbert Y. The Children's Cause (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute), 1976.

Urban Management Consultants of San Francisco, Inc. Intergovernmental Issues in Human Services Delivery: Children's Services in California (San Francisco: Urban Management Consultants), 1975.

Harvard Child Health Project. Report of the Harvard Child Health Project Task Force (Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Co.), 1977. 3 Vols.

Vol. 1: Toward a Primary Medical Care System Responsive to Children's Needs.
Vol. 2: Children's Medical Care Needs and Treatment.
Vol. 3: Developing a Better Health Care System for Children.

Specific Sources on Child Care

ABT Associates. National Day Care Study. First Annual Report (Cambridge: author), 1974-75. Vols. 1 and 2.

Bronfenbrenner, U., et al. Day Care in Context: An Ecological Perspective on Research and Public Policy (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare), December 1976. Concept paper.

Caldwell, B. M. and H. N. Ricciut (eds.). Child Development and Social Policy: Review of Child Development Research (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1973. Vol. 3.

Class, N.E., et al. A Conceptual Statement on the Enforcement of Child Day Care Licensing Standards with Special Reference to Revocation (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare), December 1976. Concept paper.

Cohen, D., et al. Federal Day Care Standards: Rationale and Recommendations (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare). Concept paper.

Cooper, S. P. History of FIDCR (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare), August 1976. Concept paper.

Costin, L. B., et al. The Challenge of Child Day Care Needs and Improved Federal and State Approaches to Day Care Standard Setting and Enforcement (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare). Concept paper.

Hall, A. and S. Weiner. The Supply of Day Care Services in Denver and Seattle (Menlo Park: Stanford Research Institute), 1976.

Heckman, J. "Effects of Child Care Programs on Women's Work Effort," Journal of Political Economy, March and April, 1974.

Hill, C. R. The Child Care Market: A Review of the Evidence and Implications For Federal Policy (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare/ASPE), January, 1977. Concept paper/FIDCR Appropriateness Study.

Husby, R. "Day Care for Families on Public Assistance; Workfare versus Welfare," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, July, 1974.

Frost, J. and H. Schneider. Types of Day Care and Parents' Preferences, Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies, 1971.

Kagan, J. The Effect of Day Care on the Infant (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare), 1976. Concept paper.

Keating, Tom. Child Care and Public Policy: A Dilemma at All Levels (Claremont Graduate School, Public Policy Studies), July 1975.

Kurtz, M., et al. A Study of the Demand for Child Car by Working Mothers (Menlo Park: Stanford Research Institute), 1975.

Larson, M. A. Federal Policy for Preschool Services: Assumptions and Evidence (Menlo Park: Stanford Research Institute), May 1975.

Lave, J. and S. Angrist. Child Care Arrangement of Working Mothers: Social and Economic Aspects. School of Urban and Public Affairs, Carnegie-Mellon University, 1974.

Morgan, G. G. Legal Aspects of Federal Day Care Standards (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare), March 1976. Concept paper.

Morgan, J. N. (ed.). Five Thousand American Families: Patterns of Economic Progress (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research), 1975. Vol. III.
Articles:
Duncan, G. J. and C. R. Hill. "Modal Choice in Child Care Arrangements."
_____. "The Child Care Mode Choice of Working Mothers."
_____ and Dickinson, K. "Child Care."

Pacific Consultants. Child Day Care Management Study. A report prepared for SRS/HEW (Berkeley: Author), August 1976.

Prescott, E., et al. The Politics of Day Care (Washington, D.C.: NAEYC) 1972.

Pizzo, P. and S. S. Aronson. Concept Paper on Health and Safety Issues in Day Care (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare), September 1976.

Rowe, R. R. Alternatives to FIDCR: The Feasibility of State Standards for Certification of Federally-Supported Day Care (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare), December 1976. Concept paper.

Ricciuti, H. N. Effects of Infant Day Care Experience on Behavior and Development: Research and Implications for Social Policy (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare), October 1976. Concept paper.

SRI. National Day Care Home Study. Phase 1, Pilot Study Report, June 1977.

California Child Care Bibliography

ABT Associates. Independent Comparative Evaluation of Child Development Programs Funded by Chapter 344, Statutes of 1976 (AB 3059). A Proposal submitted to State Department of Education, February 1977.

Child Development Programs in California (Sacramento: OCD/State Department of Education), January 1976.

Cost-Effectiveness of Publicly Subsidized Child Care. Statement to the Senate Education and Assembly Human Resources Committees. State of California Legislative Analyst, November 10, 1976.

Current Issues in Publicly Subsidized Child Care (Sacramento: Legislative Analyst), December 1975.

Publicly-Subsidized Child Care Services Administered by the Department of Education, FY 75-76 (Sacramento: OCD/SDE), May 1977.

Santa Clara County Child Care Pilot Study (Sacramento: SDE). Draft Reports.

Cost-Effectiveness of Publicly Subsidized Child Care. Testimony before Senate and Assembly Joint Committee Hearing on Education, November 10, 1976.

Simmons, H.E., et al. Child Care: A Review of Social Services Funded Under Title XX of the Social Security Act (Sacramento: Social Services Division, Department of Health), April 1976.

FOOTNOTES

1. See Walter Garms, James Guthrie and Lawrence Pierce, School Finance: The Economics and Politics of Public Education (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1978).

2. Joint Legislative Audit Committee, Services to Children and Youth Administered Through State Agencies in California (Sacramento: Office of the Auditor General, 1978).

3. The National Academy of Sciences is currently assisting the Ford Foundation in designing a research agenda on children's services. The School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago, in a February 1978 proposal, is undertaking a study of the condition of children being served under Illinois' social service programs.

4. Trude W. Lash and Heidi Sigal, State of the Child Report: New York City (New York: Foundation for Child Development, 1977).

5. We had hoped to explore the reasons for the variation in services--e.g., socio-economic, politics, and delivery system variables--but were unable to collect data and did not have the controlled comparative design to explore these issues.

6. For an analysis of standards for a controlled comparison case study, see Alexander L. George, "Case Studies and Theory Development" in Paul Gordon Lauren (ed.), Diplomatic History: New Approaches (New York: Free Press, 1949).

7. Figures are from the 1977 California State Title XX Plan.

8. New York data from Walter I. Garms, "New York State Services for Children," unpublished paper (1977).

9. For a discussion of minumum floors, see Garms, Guthrie, and Pierce, op. cit., p. 225. They also discuss the foundation concept. Social service funding through private and voluntary agencies should be explored. It may be that in some areas in which services are funded at a relatively low level by governmental agencies, non-governmental entities play a substantial role in the delivery of social services.

10. Michigan data from Edward Duane and William Bridgeland, "Report to the National Consortium for Families and Children on Federally Funded Child Program in Michigan," unpublished paper (1977).

11. For an overview of accountability in education, see Joel S. Berke and Michael W. Kirst, Federal Aid to Education (Lexington: D. C. Heath, 1972).

    For an analysis of the more stringent accountability structure in education, see G. Bass and M. Kirst, "Accountability: What is the Federal Role?" (Santa Monica, CA: Rand, WN-9521-HEW, 1976).

12. We used multiple regression analysis to identify predictor variables for Title XX expenditures by county. An extensive list of income and socio-economic variables were regressed against total Title XX expenditures, total mandatory Title XX program expenditures, and total optional Title XX program expenditures. However, at best only 21 percent of the variance could be explained. We used interviews to further probe variations in local children's services.

13. For an overview of accountability techniques in education, see Leslie Browder, et al., Developing an Educationally Accountable Program (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1973).

14. For a further explanation, and application to education, see Garms, Guthrie, and Pierce, op. cit., Chapter 2.

15. See Charles Benson, "Time and How It Is Spent" in Michael Kirst and Charles Benson, Education Finance and Organization: Future Research Directions (Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education, forthcoming).